

From: Paul Choisser [<mailto:pacchoisser@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, April 26, 2011 10:54 AM
To: Alvarez, Eric@DeltaCouncil; delta_council_media@lists.ceres.ca.gov;
delta_council_information@lists.ceres.ca.gov
Subject: Responses to the Third Staff Draft of the Delta Plan

To: Honorable Delta Stewardship Council Members

From: Paul Choisser, PAC Environmental and Urban Land Use Planning Consulting Services

RE: Public Comments regarding the Third Draft of the Delta Plan

Delta Stewardship Council,

I'll start this correspondence the same way I have started most, if not all, of my correspondence to you, so you will (or may) recognize who I am. My name is Paul Choisser. I am a Concord, CA resident, owner of PAC Environmental and Urban Land Use Planning Consulting Services, a Delta boater and a Delta fisherman. I spoke at the January 20, 2011 Delta Plan Notice of Preparation (NOP) Scoping Session for the Propose Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Delta Plan at a meeting held in Concord, CA on that date. I followed up with written correspondence to clarify, memorialize and perhaps expand on those comments.

In these comments on the third Draft of the Delta Plan I wanted to indicate what I feel is a needed for the document to provide clarifying graphics to make the document more readable, accessible and understandable to the layperson, breakup the monotony of text and insure that all parties who attempt to review and, eventually, once it is adopted, attempt to use and utilized the document and the information that it provides and an adequate and accessible means to accomplish such goals. I do feel that the inclusion and use of the "flow charts" as are currently indicated in the draft document is commendable and appropriate. I do realize that such further graphical representations are currently being considered for development.

I, also, wanted to extend my appreciation to the Delta Independent Science Board (ISB) for their comprehensive and analytical comments on the "findings" section and for going far beyond and above what I would have expected such a board to take on as their responsibilities in reviewing the document. I will elaborate on that after my initial comments on the third staff draft of the Delta Plan as follows:

The Delta Plan document and the issues it is mandated to, and is attempting to, address, as I see it, are basically ones of a geographical, particularly bio-geographical, and economic nature. Therefore there is a Geographical and Economic basis for needed graphical representations in the document. I have noted that there is only one map contained within the document as, so far, presented. Some of my comments contain herein may be premature but should be considered as a preemptive notice of what should be expected to be represented within the document as it develops and policies and programs are generated. My comments are not to be considered as comprehensive and should only be considered to be general in nature and not specific to individual, or as yet to be, cited text within the draft document. If I develop the available time I will attempt to modify this correspondence to be more specifically directed to sections and text within the document. Again I realize that graphical representational material is being developed for the document and will probably comment on that material as it is presented to the public in subsequent iterations of the drafts of the Delta Plan.

1) In the sections pertaining to biological populations and sustainability failure and the necessity to address the need as such, I have noted that there is only one map contained within the document as, so far, presented. There are no map views or plan views of population migratory patterns and potential

population dynamic failure causal areas. No section views of appropriately engineering designs for redressing the issues such as remedies pertaining to diverting, moving, transferring or pumping water resources around the Delta from the Sacramento River to the transfer pumping stations and the recommendations as to how they should be constructed, or other remedies as to how the current situation could or should be repaired or redressed. For the reasons I have expressed above I believe there should be.

2) In the sections pertaining to potential levee failure and necessity to address the need as such As such, I have noted that there is only one map contained within the document as, so far, presented. There are no map views or plan views of potential levee failure areas. No section views of appropriately engineering designs for levees as they should be constructed, repaired or redressed. For the reasons I have expressed above I believe there should be.

3) In the sections pertaining to economic analysis there are no pie charts or bar graphs representing such economic assertions, observations, explanations and analysis of the economic implications and expectations of the analysis and underlying principals and goals of the programs and policies contained within the document. For the reasons I have expressed above I believe there should be.

Again, I also wanted to extend my appreciation to the Delta Independent Science Board (ISB) for their comprehensive and far reaching review of the document and for going far and above (beyond the call of duty) what I would have expected such a board to take on as their responsibilities in reviewing the document. When I read their comments on the findings I believe they were doing their duty in reviewing the document and making comments however I perceived an aspect of their review to almost encroach on editing the document to the level of which I found commendable. The role of editorship is an exceptional quality of taking on more than what I expected they would be undertaking although I see how that process blended with what I expected of them in that they appeared to be essentially saying either "you can't say this because you can't document what you are saying" or "there is no scientific basis for these comments to be included in the document" or "let's just not go there, but let's go here". The role of the reviewers of the scientific readability, reliability, comprehensiveness, sophistication, analysis and just plain review of the good science of the scientific assertions contained within the document is certainly an admirable one and I congratulate them on their thoroughness. I feel we are fortunate to have them take the initiative to expand upon their role and scope of services and responsibilities.

And, further I wish to thank the Delta Stewardship Council for the opportunity to comment on the document as it is developed and for the openness and extension of openness of process, opportunities programs and policies for the the public to contribute to the review of the document's analysis, programs and policies.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Paul Choisser

PAC Environmental and Urban Land Use Planning Consulting Services
1741 Lynwood Drive
Concord, CA 94519-1210
pacchoisser@yahoo.com